



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/664,578

09/18/2000

Stephen C. Roderick

109889-130244

3952

25943

7590

06/23/2009

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900

1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE

PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/23/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/664,578

Applicant(s)

RODERICK, STEPHEN C.

Examiner

ADAM L. BASEHOAR

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6, 10, 11, 23, 26-28, 31-33, 35, 37, 38, 40-43 and 45 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6, 10, 11, 23, 26-28, 31-33, 35, 37, 38, 40-43 and 45 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 April 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 04/15/09.
2. All previous rejections to the claims have been maintained.
3. Claims 3-6, 10, 11, 23, 26-28, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 40-43, 45 are pending. Claims 27, 31, 40 are independent claims.

Drawings

4. The drawings were received on 04/15/09. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 6, 10-11, 23, 26-28, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 40-43, and 45 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al (5,897,622), in view of Wolff (6,247,047), in view of Bezos et al. (6,029,141), and further in view of Tobin (US-2001/0007991 07/12/01).

As per independent apparatus claim 27 (and similarly, storage medium claim 31, and claim 40), Blinn discloses processing queries, including the dynamic generation of web pages (see columns 3-4), in which a page is composed for display by processing a template having a request for information (query) from an order. Refer also to Blinn's figures 1, 2, 3A, 3B, 5, 10, 12, 14, in which various embodiments illustrating the operation of the dynamic page

generator are disclosed, including a processor, storage device, presenting (i.e. provisioning) information to a user etc.

Blinn teaches a URL with a server and various identifiers (Blinn column 7 lines 14-26). Blinn does not specifically teach a product identifier immediately following a server name (separated by a separator). However, Wolff teaches a URL banner with a server name (www.bannerbuy.com) with a unique product identifier (e.g. unique indicia reflective of a product) immediately appended after said server and separator (www.bannerbuy.com/12345) (see Wolff Figure 2 item 104, also Abstract, and column 8 lines 35-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wolff to Blinn, providing Blinn the benefit of adaptation to various typical types of URL resource calls.

Blinn does not specifically teach a “*pseudo*” resource identifier, with identification of a marketing source (Internet or non-Internet) marketing code. However, Bezos teaches an Internet based customer referral system comprising a URL address referencing a registered associate (e.g. an associate Web page) within said URL (see Bezos column 12 line 60 to column 13 line 8 – especially “mystoreA”). See also Bezos column 6 lines 30-48, column 7 lines 25-30. It is noted that, although “mystore” is taught as an Internet Web site, Bezos also teaches an associate source using a non-hypertextual catalog (including paper-based catalogs) (Bezos column 8 lines 42-48), and that non Web-based technology can be used (Bezos column 8 lines 32-42). It is also noted that a registered associate such as “mystore” is a media type. Therefore, Bezos’s resource identifier can be interpreted as a form of “*pseudo*” resource identifier, since said identifier identifies the source of marketing (i.e. internet based, or non-Internet based), along with a product identifier (e.g. ISBN number) in the same URL. It is also noted that column 8 lines 42-

48 declares an associate as a non-Internet source (a paper catalog), said catalog instructing a user to input a URL (with the referral info.) into a browser. It is at least obvious to the skilled artisan that Bezos's system knows an associate's source as Internet based, or paper catalog based, so as to pay commissions accordingly, minimize fraud, prevent links to inappropriate sources, etc., therefore the referral information in Bezos's URL can be reasonably interpreted as a form of Internet or non-Internet marketing code. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bezos to Blinn, providing Blinn the benefit of increasing sales of products by awarding commissions.

Blinn does not specifically teach maintaining statistics for said marketing codes. However, Bezos teaches report generation software providing information regarding number of books ordered through an associate's links (Bezos column 16 lines 10-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bezos to Blinn, providing Blinn the benefit of providing feedback reports to assist the associates in conducting business (see Bezos column 16 lines 27-30).

Regarding "*an industry standard product identifier*" (independent claim 29), Blinn does not specifically teach this. However, Bezos teaches an ISBN number (an industry standard product identifier) embedded within a URL (Bezos column 12 line 60 to column 13 line 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bezos to Blinn, providing Blinn the benefit of standardization that an industry standard identifier brings.

Blinn does not specifically teach a "type of media", Internet medium, television, print, etc, as well as a buyer's guide. However, Bezos teaches Bezos teaches an Internet based

customer referral system comprising a URL address referencing a registered associate (e.g. an associate Web page) within said URL (see Bezos column 8 lines 32-48: "web site...hypertextual e-mail messages...television...catalogs" column 12 line 60 to column 13 line 8 – especially "mystoreA"). See also Bezos column 6 lines 30-48, column 7 lines 25-30. It is noted that, although "mystore" is taught as an Internet Web site, Bezos also teaches an associate source using a non-hypertextual catalog (including paper-based catalogs) (Bezos column 8 lines 42-48). It is also noted that column 8 lines 42-48 declares an associate as a non-Internet source (a paper catalog), said catalog instructing a user to input a URL (with the referral info.) into a browser. It is at least obvious to the skilled artisan that Bezos's system knows an associate's source as Internet based, or paper catalog based (typically a form of buyer's guide), so as to pay commissions accordingly, minimize fraud, prevent links to inappropriate sources, etc. The referral information in Bezos's URL can be reasonably interpreted as a form of Internet or non-Internet marketing code. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bezos to Blinn, providing Blinn the benefit of increasing sales of products by awarding commissions, and to provide alternate ways of buying products.

While Blinn, Wolff, and Bezos all teach dynamically generating and returning a web page to a user based on the on the URL query, neither of the references specifically teach at least a portion of the information presented in the returned web page refers to the type of requesting media. Tobin teaches dynamically presenting a portion of information in a retrieved information page based at least in part on the type of media a URL was embedded in (Paragraphs 8-10, 12-13, 40-41: e.g. "Web site pages are dynamically customized...in graphic and a content format to take advantage of the consumer's familiarity with...participating Web site", 43, 59: e.g. "The

Web site pages of...are customized...modified version of the header", and 62-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the associate referral system of Bezos to have altered the returned information page to refer to the URL media type as shown in Tobin, because Tobin taught that by modifying the retrieved web page to include the referral information the client's familiarity with the marketing partner's brand could be reinforced as well increase the consumer's trust in the participating Internet site (Paragraphs 8, 40, 43: "advantages", 59: "familiarity...brand is reinforced"). This combination would have in turn provided the same similar benefits to the system of Blinn provided through the already relied upon teachings of Bezos.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Blinn does not specifically teach an ISPID. However, Bezos teaches an ISBN number (a form of ISPID) (Bezos column 12 line 60 to column 13 line 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bezos to Blinn, providing Blinn the benefit of standardization (ISPID) that an industry standard identifier (ISBN) brings.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Blinn, Wolff, and Bezos teach queries using an ISBN (a form of ISPID), see above. It is noted that Blinn dynamically creates Web pages accordingly if said page is not already residing in a cache (as is known in the art).

In regard to dependent claims 10, 11, Blinn does not specifically teach automatically and periodically generates marketing reports, or of a user requesting a report on demand.

However, Bezos teaches weekly automatic report generation software providing information regarding number of books ordered through an associate's links (Bezos column 16 lines 10-26).

Bezos also teaches that an associate can access an online menu for custom reports, and to set up customized frequency of reports (i.e. on demand, etc.) (Bezos column 16 lines 35-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bezos to Blinn, providing Blinn the benefit of providing periodic feedback reports to assist the associates in conducting business (see Bezos column 16 lines 27-30).

In regard to dependent claim 23, Blinn does not specifically teach an ISPID. However, Bezos teaches an ISBN number (a form of ISPID) (Bezos column 12 line 60 to column 13 line 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bezos to Blinn, providing Blinn the benefit of standardization (ISPID) that an industry standard identifier (ISBN) brings.

In regard to dependent claims 26, 45, Blinn does not specifically teach automatically and periodically generates marketing reports, or of a user requesting a report on demand. However, Bezos teaches weekly automatic report generation software providing information regarding number of books ordered through an associate's links (Bezos column 16 lines 10-26).

Bezos also teaches that an associate can access an online menu for custom reports, and to set up customized frequency of reports (i.e. on demand, etc.) (Bezos column 16 lines 35-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bezos to Blinn, providing Blinn the benefit of providing periodic feedback reports to assist the associates in conducting business (see Bezos column 16 lines 27-30).

In regard to dependent claim 28, claim 28 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 27, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 32, claim 32 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 31, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 33, Blinn, Wolff, and Bezos teach queries using an ISBN (a form of ISPID), see above. It is noted that Blinn dynamically creates Web pages accordingly if said page is not already residing in a cache (as is known in the art).

In regard to dependent claims 35, 41, Blinn teaches querying a database stored locally (Blinn column 6 lines 25-30). In addition, both Blinn and Wolff teach a URL with a server and various identifiers querying remote sources (see the rejection of claim 29 above).

In regard to dependent claims 37-38, 42-43, Blinn does not specifically teach a “type of media”, television, print, etc, as well as a buyer’s guide. However, Bezos teaches Bezos teaches an Internet based customer referral system comprising a URL address referencing a registered associate (e.g. an associate Web page) within said URL (see Bezos column 8 lines 32-48: “web

site...hypertextual e-mail messages...television...catalogs" column 12 line 60 to column 13 line 8 – especially "mystoreA"). See also Bezos column 6 lines 30-48, column 7 lines 25-30. It is noted that, although "mystore" is taught as an Internet Web site, Bezos also teaches an associate source using a non-hypertextual catalog (including paper-based catalogs) (Bezos column 8 lines 42-48). It is also noted that column 8 lines 42-48 declares an associate as a non-Internet source (a paper catalog), said catalog instructing a user to input a URL (with the referral info.) into a browser. It is at least obvious to the skilled artisan that Bezos's system knows an associate's source as Internet based, TV based, or paper catalog based (typically a form of buyer's guide), so as to pay commissions accordingly, minimize fraud, prevent links to inappropriate sources, etc. The referral information in Bezos's URL can be reasonably interpreted as a form of Internet or non-Internet marketing code. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bezos to Blinn, providing Blinn the benefit of increasing sales of products by awarding commissions, and to provide alternate ways of buying products.

Blinn, Wolff, and Bezos teach queries using an ISBN (a form of ISPID), see above. It is noted that Blinn dynamically creates Web pages accordingly if said page is not already residing in a cache (as is known in the art).

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U. S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al., Wolff, Bezos et al., and Tobin, as applied to independent claim 27 above, and further in view of Bijmagte (5,235,680).

In regard to dependent claim 4, it is noted that Blinn fails to teach details of "real estate identifier" (MLS). However, Bijmagte's disclosure is directed toward providing real estate

information, and in view of Blinn's disclosure of processing merchant information (see columns 7-12, e.g., column 10, lines 5 et seq--The merchant system 120 provides a set of HTML, pages dynamically generated from queries to a database 121 having store information, such as inventory data, advertising copy, product images, pricing, customer information and promotions.) One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to process queries that include real estate information (i.e. MLS), in order to help the user to narrow searches.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U. S. C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al., Wolff, Bezos, and Tobin as applied to independent claim 27 above, and further in view of Kirkevold et al. (6,263,322).

In regard to dependent claim 5, Blinn et al. does not specifically teach a VIN code. However, Kirkevold et al. teaches querying via VIN code (Kirkevold et al. column 17 lines 35-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Kirkevold et al. to Blinn et al., providing Blinn et al. the benefit of vehicle identification as part of resource identifiers, to broaden the scope of querying.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 04/15/09 have been carefully reviewed, but are not persuasive for at least the reasons set forth below.

-In regard to the independent claims, the Applicant argues that the Bezos reference fails to teach or suggest that the URL does identify the type of media used to disseminate the URL. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Bezos clearly teaches that a defined

media type could be both the specific medium to which the URL was disseminated (column 8, lines 17-48) or the sales agent associate who was responsible for disseminating the URL to said specific medium (column 11, lines 1-15)(Fig. 4). The URL disseminated in a given media type maintained a second portion consisting of a marketing code identifying the type of media (column 12, lines 52-67; column 13, line 1-8) in form of a unique store/unique associate ID as well as a associate commission scheme ID (e.g. <http://.../mystoreA/>). Thus the correlation between the registered associate and the disseminated media types was known by the system of Bezos. The Examiner notes that as per Applicant's specification, the marketing code indicating the associated marketing material/source ("Corresponding Marketing Source") could for example be a print media, radio advertisement, and a particular sales agent (Specification: Pages 25-26: "Table 1")(emphasis added). At the very least, the Bezos reference clearly teaches wherein the URL maintains a code for the unique associate/unique store ID (column 9, lines 49-53), which is equivalent to the media type of "a particular sales agent."

Applicant also argues that the amendment to the independent claims, wherein the "information presented in the associated page refers to the type of media", further distinguishes the claimed invention over the prior art. Applicant argues that the Tobin reference, which has been relied upon to teach that a portion of the information presented in the returned web page was based in least in part on the type of requesting media, does not meet the newly claimed "refers to" limitation. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted in the rejection above, Tobin clearly teaches dynamically presenting a portion of information in a retrieved information page based at least in part on the type of media a URL was embedded in (Paragraphs 8-10, 12-13, 40-41: e.g. "Web site pages are dynamically customized...in graphic and a content format to

take advantage of the consumer's familiarity with...participating Web site", 43, 59: e.g. "The Web site pages of...are customized...modified version of the header", and 62-63). Thus Tobin teaches modifying the content and format of a rendered page to include aspects of a referencing media type. Tobin teaches embedding the URL of a referring web page into the associated information page, the URL clearly referring to the referring web page by the specific URL address. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. Specification: Page 25, lines 15-19: "looks up the marketing code to correlate it...further refine and customize the information provisioned...to provision with the requested information page/directory a 'thank you' for using the source marketing materials") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The portion of the Specification to which the Applicant relies shows an explicit reference to the media type being incorporated into the information page (i.e. displaying text saying/disclosing the exact type of media). However the claims do not necessarily require such a detailed feature and in general the Examiner notes that the scope of phrase "refers to", as currently claimed, is broadly recited.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ADAM L. BASEHOAR whose telephone number is (571)272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178